

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 8-11, and 15-21 currently stand rejected. Claims 5-7 and 12-14 are objected to. Claims 1, 8, 15, and 18-21 have been amended. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1, 4-8, 11-15, and 18-21 and consideration of the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

Claims 15-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 15 and 18-21 have been amended to overcome the rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection

Claims 1-3, 8-10, and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,136,374 (Kompella). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended. Claim 1 recites, in part, a plurality of IWU edge nodes adopted for exchanging MPLS frames with a plurality of client devices. An IWU switch node communicates with the plurality of IWU edge nodes being configured to receive MPLS frames. An MPLS frame includes an inner label, an outer MPLS label, and data transported in the MPLS frame. The data transported in the MPLS frame is transferred only to the one designated IWU edge node based on the IWU switch node processing the outer MPLS label. The one designated IWU edge node transfers the data in the MPLS frame to a designated client device that is designated by the inner label of the MPLS frame.

Kompella fails to teach that the data transported in the MPLS frame is transferred *only* to the one designated IWU edge node based on the IWU switch node processing the outer MPLS label. Kompella discloses that the outer label is used to transport the packet to the egress service provider edge device 212b (col. 9, lines 56-58). However, Kompella does not disclose that the packet is sent *only* to the egress service provider edge device 212b using the outer label.

In contrast, claim 1 requires that the data transported in the MPLS frame is transferred *only* to the one designated IWU edge node based on the IWU switch node processing the outer MPLS label. Kompella does not disclose that the packet is sent to only a single service provider edge device using the outer label. Therefore, Kompella fails to teach that the data transported in the MPLS frame is transferred only to the one designated IWU edge node based on the IWU switch node processing the outer MPLS label. Claim 1 is therefore patentable over the cited reference.

Based on the foregoing comments, the Applicant contends that claim 1 is allowable in view of the cited reference, and such indication is respectfully requested. Independent claims 8 and 15 were rejected for reasons similar to claim 1. Claims 8 and 15 contain limitations similar to claim 1 and are therefore allowable over the art of record for the same reasons as claim 1. While separately allowable over the art of record, the remaining dependent claims depend from otherwise allowable independent claims. The Applicant therefore refrains from a discussion of the dependent claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 4, 11, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,136,374 (Kompella), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0223499 (Sanderson). A discussion of this rejection is obviated in view of the discussion above distinguishing Kompella from independent claims 1, 8, and 15. While separately allowable over the art of record, the remaining dependent claims depend from otherwise allowable independent claims. The Applicant therefore refrains from a discussion of the dependent claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-7 and 12-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicant presently refrains from incorporating any of the limitations in claims 5-7 and 12-14 into

independent claims 1 and 8 based on the discussion above distinguishing Kompella from claims 1 and 8.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, the Applicant submits that the claims in their present form are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of clarity and brevity. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims.

The Applicant believes no fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine fees are necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 210765.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas M. Grover/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Douglas M. Grover, Reg. No. 52,974

Setter Roche LLP

Telephone: (720) 562-2280

E-mail: doug@setterroche.com

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Melissa A. Jobe

Sprint Law Department

6450 Sprint Parkway

Mailstop: KSOPHN0312-3A461

Overland Park, KS 66251